



IS IT TO THE END OF COMMON CENSURE OF PATENT OFFICES OF *proving* UNITED STATES? Sent "Notice of abandonment" (08/07/2007) is artificial

FOR OBLIGATORY FORMAL REGISTRATION : Appl. 10/508967 (PCT/IB03/03315)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria
Virginia, 22313-1450 USA

Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe, 75010
Paris France
Paris, 28th August 2007.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 28 2007

Mr.Jon Dudas (personally), Under Secretary for Intellectual Property, Director of USPTO (copies to USPTO Top).

Dear Sir, Sending of "Notice of Abandonment" (08/07/2007) had no any sense. I sent even TWO identical registered letters 134g and 130g (03/22/07, 03/23/07) having post back acknowledgement with stamp of "USPTO Mail Centre" (see copies). Moreover, I sent text to this USPTO Top with attachments (03/26/2007, 13:48). You can consider all it as "Certificate of mailing" against sent however "Notice of abandonment". So you have de facto these letters in USPTO in asking, for instance, above "USPTO Mail Centre". Consequently, it rather reflects censure of my clear answer with very important Supplements (moreover with very NET constructions of dependent and independent claims and finding of important slip), that are justly openly censured in United States of Europe (EPO). But in difference, as "last event", it was written:

"19/04/2007 "Answer for Examination report" " but text was censured at "file wrapper" and in both UNITED STATES other Applications were completely shown. It must reflect that the same scientists interest with justly this very important discoveries and innovations, arbitrary destiny of which became too clear. Anyway, thank you for coming ending of scientific censure, even at Register, in famous United States. Sincerely yours Dr.Y.Zagyansky *Yul Zagyansky*

P.S. Very intentionally and selectively USPTO does not want to precise its Legislation, concerning, justly, "Notice of abandonment", that could be the proven intentional CRIME in the positive (for Applicant) case. Since §5 of Covering Letter of my N°10/505353- 11/08/2004, in spite of my numerous repeating in my BOTH Applications, USPTO does not answer: "Must USPTO send final registered letter if there is no Applicant's answer? Because in 37 CRF §1.8 (§512 MPEP) "Certificate of mailing or transmission" there is no mention about even Declaration for nonreceiving of only USPTO (USPTOI) letters, that normally had to take place if there were USPTO's registered letter. Because normally numerous witnesses of it as Patent agents with Jurists could be asked to declare on honour. To pay \$1000 for post loss (or unsent?: see justly above) letter without ANY guiltiness must be surely impossible as law. Again, please to clarify such dark point in Legislation. Persistent intentional silence could be proven intentional crime in the positive (for applicant) case. E-mail will be sent as "forward" of 03/26/2007 with all its attachments. *"If there is NO USPTO registered letter"*

<p>75272 PARIS 00800 COURT 10.80EUR 23/03/07</p>		<p>75100 PARIS 00800 COURT 10.80EUR 22/03/07</p>		<p>75100 PARIS 00800 COURT 10.80EUR 22/03/07</p>	
<p>COMMISSEUR DES PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 USA (Am. 1997)</p>		<p>COMMISSEUR DES PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 USA (Am. 1997)</p>		<p>COMMISSEUR DES PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 USA (Am. 1997)</p>	
<p>Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe, 75010 Paris France</p>		<p>Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe, 75010 Paris France</p>		<p>Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide, 22 rue Ste Marthe, 75010 Paris France</p>	

RECEIVED
MAR 9 2007
USPTO MAIL CENTER

AVIS DE RECEPTION
RIS00417224FR
95293
20/03/2007
Dr.Y.Zagyansky, Entraide,
22 rue Ste Marthe,
75010 Paris

FRANCE